

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

The concept of opinion diversity has an inherent regional context. The very word diversity requires multiplicity, economic, social, and regional. Commercial competition can never be a valid standard for viewer diversity. Unencumbered media opinion-diversity can only be promoted by protecting local media-ownership. Only through this governmental protection can the myriad of viewpoints across this great land find their scion.

Broadcast TV remains and will continue the primary source of news well into the foreseeable future. Websites and minor cable programming remain infantile. The growing new sources of information only beg for their own diversity ownership-protection rather than precipitating any protection-reduction. CableTV-alternative diversity and its minority ownership may be floundering, at best. But, commonly owned media's record has much more disturbing consequences. Larger conglomerate ownership only serves to stifle our vital diversity and erode the public trust this diversity has been mandated to protect. This process cannot be rationally in the public interest.

Media opinion diversity is constitutionally mandated and in the public interest. Media opinion protection is judicially entrusted to our governmental regulatory agency. It is the FCC's duty and responsibility to strengthen rather than weaken limitations that protect diversity of media ownership across America.

Dr. Robert L. Chacona